

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NADINE HAYS,) CASE No. CV 11-3198-DMG (PJW)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
) FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,) DISMISSING ACTION WITH PREJUDICE
)
 Defendants.)
)
)


Before the Court is Plaintiff's third motion for reconsideration of the Court's order dismissing the action with prejudice.¹ [Doc. No. 332.] The Court rejected the first motion on the merits and struck the second motion on the ground that it was a repeat of the first. Plaintiff's third motion is brought on essentially identical grounds and is denied for the same reasons as the first. Plaintiff has not established that the Court made a mistake within the meaning of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) when it dismissed her action with prejudice. See *Clark v. County of Tulare*, 755 F. Supp. 2d at

¹ Plaintiff captioned her motion, "Motion for a Modified Judgment So that Justice Can Be Served." Because she refers to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) in the motion, the Court has liberally construed it as a motion for reconsideration. See *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976) (pleadings by pro se litigants are to be liberally construed).

1 1099 (disagreeing with the district court's initial order is not
2 grounds for a motion for reconsideration, which should not be "used to
3 ask the court to rethink what it has already thought"). Further, the
4 Court has already denied Plaintiff's request to stay the execution of
5 the judgment to allow her to complete discovery in other cases. That
6 request is denied, again. The Court will not entertain any further
7 requests for reconsideration.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.
9

10 DATED: May 13, 2015


11 _____
12 DOLLY M. GEE
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18 Presented by:
19 
20 _____
21 PATRICK J. WALSH
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28

PATRICK J. WALSH
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

O:\ECF Ready\LA11CV03198DMG(PJW)_Hays_ord.wpd